

Date of Hearing: April 24, 2024

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Juan Carrillo, Chair

AB 1950 (Wendy Carrillo) – As Amended April 10, 2024

SUBJECT: City of Los Angeles: former Chavez Ravine property: eminent domain: compensation

SUMMARY: Creates a task force to study how to compensate the former residents of the Chavez Ravine area of the City of Los Angeles who were forcibly displaced by the City in the 1950s. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Provides that the purpose of this bill is to provide compensation to residents and landowners displaced from the Chavez Ravine area between 1950 to 1961, inclusive.
- 2) Defines the following terms:
 - a) “City” means the City of Los Angeles.
 - b) “County” means the County of Los Angeles.
 - c) “Descendant” means a lineal descendant born in a direct biological line from a displaced decedent of the Chavez Ravine property. Descendants may include, but are not limited to, a person’s children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren.
- 3) Specifies how any compensation awarded pursuant to this bill is to be divided between living descendants.
- 4) Requires the City of Los Angeles to create a task force, as specified in 15), below, to provide a report to the City containing recommendations for compensating the residents and land owners of Chavez Ravine.
- 5) Requires the City of Los Angeles, after reviewing the task force reports and compensation recommendations, to decide on one of the following forms of compensation for former landowners and their descendants of Chavez Ravine:
 - a) Convey city-owned real property for housing, use, and enjoyment equal to the square footage area of land acquired by the city from the property owners unjustly displaced between 1950 and 1961, inclusive. No legislative or administrative approvals by the city or council or other city departments shall be necessary to implement this requirement, and the property shall be exempt from the Surplus Land Act and other public transfer restrictions only for the purposes of this bill.
 - b) Compensation for the taking of former landowners’ private property through monetary compensation, equal to the fair market value at the time of sale or taking, adjusted for inflation and subject to specified tax exemptions.
- 6) Provides that the City of Los Angeles must compensate non-landowning residents of Chavez Ravine in the form of relocation benefits, health care benefits, employment-oriented services,

educational scholarships, or other forms of compensation deemed fair and equitable by the task force.

- 7) Requires the City of Los Angeles, upon reviewing the report of the task force and no later than June 1, 2028, to determine other additional compensation for former residents, if deemed to serve the best interests of the city and the public, as specified.
- 8) Requires the City of Los Angeles to submit a report to the task force and the public no later than January 1, 2029, detailing the methods and timeline for compensating residents and former landowners of Chavez Ravine, as specified.
- 9) Requires the City of Los Angeles, on or before January 1, 2027, to create an official and complete historical accounting of the property owners and residents who were evicted or displaced, their descendants, and land acquired through eminent domain or other coercive tactics, as specified.
- 10) Requires the City of Los Angeles to create and administer a publically accessible and searchable database including all available city and county information related to Chavez Ravine including, but not limited to, the following information:
 - a) The names and address in the Chavez Ravine area of former residents and landowners evicted or displaced.
 - b) All notices to residents and landowners from the local, state, and federal government.
 - c) Payment receipts by public and private agencies for purchase of property located in the Chavez Ravine community.
 - d) Land acquisition methods used by all public agencies to acquire the Chavez Ravine property.
 - e) Arrest records related to removal of residents and landowners.
 - f) Identification of all divisions of government involved in the displacement of Chavez Ravine residents.
 - g) Correspondence between the city and the county and private entities, public government agencies, residents, and landowners of Chavez Ravine.
- 11) Requires the database created pursuant to 10), above, to be made available to the public and task force no later than January 1, 2027, as specified.
- 12) Requires the City of Los Angeles to redact all sensitive personal information, including, but not limited to, social security numbers, driver's license numbers, and birth dates from the information contained in the database created pursuant to 10), above.
- 13) Requires the City of Los Angeles to construct a permanent memorial, to be erected no later than December 31, 2028, in recognition of the displaced residents and landowners of the Chavez Ravine community, which must include interpretive and informational signs and structures, as well as areas to accommodate public gathering and contemplation, and include

educating future generations regarding the impact of this displacement and historical discriminatory policies in the city, as specified.

- 14) Requires the task force to oversee all of the above requirements, except the creation of the searchable database as outlined in 10, above.
- 15) Requires the task force to include the following nine members:
 - a) An elected official of the city or county or an elected official designee thereof to serve as the chair of the task force.
 - b) One individual appointed by the President pro Tempore of the Senate and one individual appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, who will both serve as the co-vice chairpersons of the task force.
 - c) Two descendants of displaced Chavez Ravine landowners or residents, appointed by the Mayor of the City of Los Angeles.
 - d) The President of the United Farm Workers, or the president's designee.
 - e) The President of Public Counsel, or the president's designee.
 - f) The Chairperson of Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, or the chairperson's designee.
 - g) One member of the local, Gabrielino-Tongva Nation appointed by the council member representing the Chavez Ravine area.
- 16) Provides that the members of the task force are not entitled to compensation.
- 17) Requires the task force to oversee and create a report to the City of Los Angeles addressing all of the following:
 - a) Progress on the city's construction of the permanent memorial, as specified.
 - b) Recommendations on appropriate ways to educate the California public of the city and county's findings about Chavez Ravine, no later than January 1, 2028.
 - c) Recommendations to the city regarding compensation for former residents and landowners of Chavez Ravine or their descendants, as specified.
 - d) Recommendations on any additional appropriate compensation, in consideration of the task force's findings regarding former residents, as specified.
 - e) Identification of all the divisions of government that were involved and responsible for the displacements in Chavez Ravine.
- 18) Requires the taskforce to submit a report to the Legislature, on or before January 1, 2028, detailing its recommended remedies for compensation to former Chavez Ravine residents

and strategies for educating the public about the history and impact of the Chavez Ravine displacements, as specified.

- 19) Requires the taskforce to oversee the City's administration process of compensation to former Chavez Ravine residents, landowners, or their descendants.
- 20) Requires, on or before January 1, 2027, the task force, in consultation with the City Attorney of the City of Los Angeles, to develop an appeal process for former residents or descendants of Chavez Ravine to appeal to the city a denial of compensation as outlined in this bill.
- 21) Provides that, after the task force develops the appeals process pursuant to 20), above, or beginning January 1, 2027, whichever occurs first, a former resident or descendant of Chavez Ravine may appeal to the city a denial of compensation, as specified.
- 22) Provides that, if the city denies an appeal brought pursuant to 21), above, and the former resident or descendant of Chavez Ravine believes that the city improperly denied compensation, the former resident or descendant may petition a court for a writ of mandate, as specified, seeking to compel the City of Los Angeles to provide compensation in accordance with this bill.
- 23) Makes numerous findings and declarations related to the displacement of the residents of Chavez Ravine.
- 24) Makes the finding necessary to declare that this bill would enact a special statute.
- 25) Provides that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that this bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to current law governing state mandated local costs.
- 26) Includes a severability clause.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes the rules and regulations governing charter cities in California. (Government Code Section 34400 *et seq.*)
- 2) Provides that the power of eminent domain may be exercised to acquire property only for a public use. (Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.010.)
- 3) Provides that the power of eminent domain may be exercised to acquire property for a proposed project only if all of the following are established:
 - a) The public interest and necessity require the project;
 - b) The project is planned or located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury; and
 - c) The property sought to be acquired is necessary for the project. (Code of Civil Procedure Section 1240.030.)

- 4) Provides that a writ of mandate may be issued by any court to any inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person, to compel the performance of an act which the law specially enjoins, as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station, or to compel the admission of a party to the use and enjoyment of a right or office to which the party is entitled, and from which the party is unlawfully precluded by that inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person. (Code of Civil Procedure Section 1085.)
- 5) Specifies that when a writ of mandate is issued for the purpose of inquiring into the validity of any final administrative order or decision made as the result of a proceeding in which by law a hearing is required to be given, evidence is required to be taken, and discretion in the determination of facts is vested in the inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or officer, the case shall be heard by the court sitting without a jury. (Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5 (a).)
- 6) Applies an abuse of discretion standard to reviews of agency decision making pursuant to 5). (Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5 (b).)
- 7) Establishes and sets forth the duties of the Task force to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African Americans. (Government Code Section 8301.1 *et seq.*)

FISCAL EFFECT: This bill is keyed fiscal and contains a state-mandated local program.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Bill Summary.** This bill requires the City of Los Angeles to create a task force with specified members to provide a report to the City containing recommendations for compensating the residents and land owners of Chavez Ravine. After reviewing the task force reports and compensation recommendations, the city must decide on one of the following forms of compensation for former landowners and their descendants of Chavez Ravine:
 - a) The city may convey city-owned property for housing, use, and enjoyment equal to the square footage area of land acquired by the city from the property owners unjustly displaced between 1950 and 1961. No legislative or administrative approvals by the city or council or other city departments are necessary to implement this requirement, and the property shall be exempt from the Surplus Land Act and other public transfer restrictions.
 - b) The city may provide compensation for the taking of former landowners' property through monetary compensation, equal to the fair market value at the time of sale or taking, adjusted for inflation and subject to specified tax exemptions.

This bill also requires the City of Los Angeles to compensate non-landowning residents of Chavez Ravine in the form of relocation benefits, health care benefits, employment-oriented services, educational scholarships, or other forms of compensation deemed fair and equitable by the task force. This city must also determine other additional compensation for former residents, if deemed to serve the best interests of the city and the public, no later than June 1, 2028.

This bill requires the City of Los Angeles to submit a report to the task force and the public no later than January 1, 2029, detailing the methods and timeline for compensating residents

and former landowners of Chavez Ravine. This city must also create an official and complete historical accounting of the property owners and residents who were evicted or displaced, their descendants, and land acquired through eminent domain or other coercive tactics. The city must also create and administer a publically accessible and searchable database of all available city and county information related to Chavez Ravine, including specified information, January 1, 2027. The city must redact all sensitive personal information from the information contained in the database.

The City of Los Angeles must also construct a permanent memorial, to be erected no later than December 31, 2028, in recognition of the displaced residents and landowners of the Chavez Ravine community, with specified features.

The task force must oversee all of the above requirements, except the creation of the searchable database, and the City's administration process of compensation to former Chavez Ravine residents, landowners, or their descendants. The task force must submit a report to the Legislature, on or before January 1, 2028, detailing its recommended remedies for compensation to former Chavez Ravine residents and strategies for educating the public about the history and impact of the Chavez Ravine displacements.

The task force must also develop, by January 1, 2027 in consultation with the City Attorney of the City of Los Angeles, an appeal process for former residents or descendants of Chavez Ravine to appeal to the city a denial of compensation as outlined in this bill. After the task force develops the appeals process, or beginning January 1, 2027, whichever occurs first, a former resident or descendant of Chavez Ravine may appeal to the city a denial of compensation. If the city denies an appeal, and the former resident or descendant of Chavez Ravine believes that the city improperly denied compensation, the former resident or descendant may petition a court for a writ of mandate seeking to compel the City of Los Angeles to provide compensation in accordance with this bill.

This bill is sponsored by Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara.

- 2) **Author's Statement.** According to the author, "AB 1950, the Chavez Ravine Accountability Act aims to correct an injustice that displaced families and has lingered in the shadows of Los Angeles Eastside history for far too long. Amid the 1950s, the vibrant community of Chavez Ravine, home to mostly Mexican-American families, as well as Italian-American and Chinese-American, saw an upheaval as families were uprooted and displaced in the name of progress. Families were promised a return to better housing, but instead, they were left destitute. For generations, Chavez Ravine stood as a beacon of hope and resilience, embodying the dreams and aspirations of families who built their lives within its embrace. With this legislation, we are addressing the past, giving voice to this injustice, acknowledging the pain of those displaced, offering reparative measures, and ensuring that we honor and remember the legacy of the Chavez Ravine community."
- 3) **Background.** When most Californians think of Chavez Ravine, they contemplate images of Dodger Stadium surrounded by the wooded hills just above downtown Los Angeles. However, the area that is now known as Chavez Ravine used to be three different residential neighborhoods comprised primarily of lower income Mexican-American landowners. Throughout much of the first half of the 20th Century, the neighborhoods of La Loma, Bishop, and Palo Verde made up a vibrant ethnic enclave on 315 acres of land just north of

downtown Los Angeles. The area's rich history can be traced back to the 1840s; and the area was once home to the first Jewish settlement in Los Angeles. (Nusbaum, *Stealing Home: Los Angeles, the Dodgers, and the Lives Caught in Between*, *supra*, at p. 31.)

As noted by the author in the findings associated with this bill, although many of the residents in Chavez Ravine owned their own property, the area was not wealthy. Accordingly, city officials labeled the neighborhoods as a, "vacant shantytown," "The Poor Man's Shangri-La," and an "eyesore." When New Deal-era urban renewal policies began to proliferate, planning officials with the City of Los Angeles bemoaned the lack of public land around the downtown area. (Nusbaum, *Stealing Home: Los Angeles, the Dodgers, and the Lives Caught in Between*, *supra*, at p. 95.) Advocates for urban renewal, well-meaning yet misguided as they were, began looking at the Chavez Ravine area for redevelopment. To many New Deal-era urban planners, the Chavez Ravine area was blighted, although much of the perceived blight could be attributed to the City of Los Angeles's refusal to provide adequate city services to the area. The urban planners also ignored the fact that as modest as many of the homes in Chavez Ravine were, many of them were owned by the Mexican-American families who called the area home.

Following World War II, and the associated influx of veterans to Los Angeles, the area attracted the attention of Citizens Housing Council member and Los Angeles Housing Authority employee Frank Wilkinson. Wilkinson envisioned turning the Chavez Ravine area into public housing, specifically a grand project known as Elysian Park Heights. (*Id.* at p. 135.) By July of 1950, formal notices were sent to the residents of La Loma, Bishop, and Palo Verde that the City of Los Angeles intended to purchase properties in the area via eminent domain and construct public housing on the site. (*Id.* at 143.) Seeking an orderly purchase of the Chavez Ravine properties, Wilkinson recruited local religious and educational leaders to his cause of enticing families to sell their properties to the City quickly and for amounts below market rate. Many families sold quickly, accepting cash settlements before the City commenced eminent domain proceedings, despite the relatively low offers of compensation from the City of Los Angeles. (Nusbaum, *Stealing Home: Los Angeles, the Dodgers, and the Lives Caught in Between*, *supra*, at p. 158.) However, many families resisted and refused the City's compensation offers. An April 1951, a city planning meeting was packed with protesters from the Palo Verde neighborhood and planning meetings would continue to be protest sites for much of the summer of 1951. (*Id.* at pp. 160-161.) Despite the protests, the City Council approved the Los Angeles Housing Authority's request to proceed with eminent domain in the area.

Ironically, it was Frank Wilkinson's attempt to use eminent domain in Chavez Ravine that would doom the Elysian Park Heights project and Wilkinson's career. At an August 1952 court hearing contesting the City's use of eminent domain in Chavez Ravine Wilkinson was asked to "list all organizations, political or otherwise, that he had belongs to..." since college. Wilkinson demurred, seeking to avoid admitting in court that he was a member of the Communist Party. (*Id.* at p. 178.) This development was seized upon by Los Angeles's large private land developers, through their front organization CASH or Citizens Against Socialist Housing, and weaponized to attack and essentially end public housing developments in the City of Los Angeles. (Podair, *City of Dreams: Dodger Stadium and the Birth of Modern Los Angeles* (2017) at p. 40.) Within months, Wilkinson was appearing before the California Senate's Committee on Un-American Activities and the City of Los

Angeles was left holding title to hundreds of properties in Chavez Ravine without any clear use for the land.

In 1957, the City of Los Angeles would find a new use for the Chavez Ravine properties. After Brooklyn Dodger's owner Walter O'Malley, fighting and losing his own land use battle in New York City, decided to move the team to Los Angeles, the Los Angeles City Council agreed to trade the land it owned in Chavez Ravine to O'Malley in return for the land he owned around Los Angeles' Wrigley Field. (Podair, *City of Dreams: Dodger Stadium and the Birth of Modern Los Angeles*, *supra*, p. 18.) That land deal was unsurprisingly challenged in court on the ground that, because the Chavez Ravine property had been taken via eminent domain, it must be used for a "public purpose" and not a privately owned baseball stadium. However, in a harbinger of future takings cases, the California Supreme Court upheld the land transfer paving the way for Dodger Stadium to be constructed in Chavez Ravine. (*City of Los Angeles v. Superior Court of County of Los Angeles* (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 423.)

Throughout all of the anti-communist machinations within city government and the legal battles over the use of eminent domain to obtain land for a private organization, many of the original residents of Chavez Ravine remained in their homes throughout the 1950s, even though the City technically owned their land. While the neighborhood had lost much of its vibrancy after the initial land sales, many aspects of the tight-knit community remained intact. Despite the efforts of activists, some of who were anti-tax advocates using the Chavez Ravine cause for their own purposes, the California Supreme Court's decision eliminated the final barrier protecting the area. On May 8, 1959, Los Angeles County Sheriff Deputies forcibly detained and removed the last residents from Chavez Ravine and their properties promptly were bulldozed. (Nusbaum, *Stealing Home: Los Angeles, the Dodgers, and the Lives Caught in Between*, *supra*, at p. 256.) Many of those who held out until the very end were left with nothing.

On April 19, 1962, the first night game was played at Dodger Stadium. Many of the former residents of Chavez Ravine, now scattered across the City, listened to Jamie Jarrín call the game on the radio. (*Id.* at p. 285.)

- 4) **Surplus Land Act.** The Surplus Land Act (SLA) spells out the steps local agencies must follow when they dispose of land they no longer need. Before local officials can dispose of property, they must declare that the land is no longer necessary for the agency's use in a public meeting and declare the land either "surplus land" or "exempt surplus land." The SLA designates certain types of land as "exempt surplus land," which is not subject to the requirements of the SLA. All other surplus land must follow the procedures laid out in the SLA.

After a local agency declares that a piece of land is surplus to its needs (and is not exempt), the agency must send a written notice of availability to various public agencies and nonprofit groups, referred to as "housing sponsors," notifying them that land is available for any of the following purposes:

- a) Low- and moderate-income housing.
- b) Park and recreation, and open space.
- c) School facilities.

- d) Infill opportunity zones or transit village plans.

If another agency or housing sponsor wants to purchase or lease the surplus land for one of these purposes, it must tell the disposing agency within 60 days. Except where the surplus land is currently used for park or recreational purposes, the local agency must give priority to the housing sponsor that proposes to provide the greatest level of affordable housing on the land. If the surplus land is currently used for park or recreational purposes, the disposing agency must give first priority to an entity that agrees to continue to use the site for park or recreational purposes.

If the local agency and any of the prioritized entities are not able to negotiate a mutually satisfactory price after 90 days of good faith negotiations, the local agency may proceed to sell the land on the open market.

- 5) **Policy Considerations.** The Committee may wish to consider the following considerations relating to the Surplus Land Act:

- a) **Exemptions.** The bill states that properties identified by the City as potential avenues of restitution for displaced families that lived in Chavez Ravine are exempt from the Surplus Land Act. However, “exempt surplus land” is a defined term within the SLA, so declaring them “exempt” would not release these dispositions from the Surplus Lands Act. AB 480 (Ting), Chapter 788, Statutes of 2023, and SB 747 (Caballero), Chapter 786, Statutes of 2023, worked in tandem to update the Surplus Lands Act just last year. These bills added exemptions to the SLA that streamline the disposals for very small and, separately, very large disposals.
- b) **Parcels Less Than Half Acre.** AB 480 (Ting) and SB 747 (Caballero) created an exemption for properties less than one-half acre. In order to be eligible for an exemption, the property cannot be contiguous to land owned by a state or local agency that is used for open-space or low- and moderate-income housing purposes.

If this bill were to become law and the City of Los Angeles were to provide land as restitution for former residents of Chavez Ravine, this exemption would likely not provide the flexibility necessary to dispose of the parcels to the affected parties. Exemptions under the SLA require written findings to be made for each disposal to ensure that the property is consistent with the exemption it is claiming eligibility for. Considering that this bill requires the City to dispose of land to an undetermined number of individuals for private use, the City would need to provide written findings for each property under one-half acre and prove that the property is consistent with state law. This could, and likely would, place significant administrative burden and create delays in providing restitution.

Originally intended as a way for an agency to dispose of parcels needed for easements, ingress, and egress or dispose of parcels that were too small and oddly shaped to provide the public agency beneficial use, the exemption for properties under one-half acre would likely not address the needs of the City to dispose of land under this unique scenario.

- c) **Dispositions Over 10 Acres.** The requirement under this bill poses a unique problem that the Surplus Land Act has not considered before. While the SLA does allow for bundling

of adjacent and nonadjacent sites, these types of disposals had master developments in mind. AB 480 (Ting) created an avenue for public agencies seeking to dispose of adjacent and non-adjacent parcels totaling to more than 10 acres. However to be eligible for this exemption, the disposal must: have an open competitive solicitation process; must result in 300 residential units or 10 times the number units per acre (with a maximum of 10,000 units), whichever is higher; require that at least 25% of the total residential units be affordable; and require development of affordable units at the same rate as market rate units. This exemption would likely not provide enough flexibility for the City of Los Angeles to comply with the requirements of this bill.

d) **Clarifying Intent.** The intent of the bill is ensure that the Surplus Lands Act and other public transfer restrictions do not create barriers to providing restitution. However, the bill uses verbiage that indicates that the disposal of public land are exempt from the Surplus Lands Act and public transfer restrictions. The Committee may wish to consider if clarifying that the Surplus Lands Act and public transfer restrictions do not apply to these properties may better achieve the author's intent.

6) **Committee Amendments.** In order to address the policy consideration above, the Committee may wish to amend the bill as follows:

(c) (1) The city shall create a task force, in accordance with the requirements set forth in subdivision (h). Upon the city's review of the task force reports and compensation recommendations as outlined in subdivision (j), the city shall decide on one of the following forms of compensation for former landowners or their descendants:

(A) Convey city-owned real property for housing, use, and enjoyment equal to the square footage area of land acquired by the city from the property owners unjustly displaced between 1950 and 1961, inclusive. Notwithstanding any other law, no legislative or administrative approvals by the city council or other city departments shall be necessary for the implementation of this section, and ~~the property shall be exempt from the Surplus Land Act and other public transfer restrictions only for the purpose of this chapter~~ , **for the purposes of this chapter, the Surplus Land Act and other public transfer restrictions shall not apply to the properties identified as a form of compensation.**

7) **Previous Legislation.** SB 796 (Bradford), Chapter 796, Statutes of 2021, required the Director of Parks and Recreation, by December 31, 2021, to execute a deed amendment to exclude Bruce's Beach, a portion of land within Manhattan State Beach, from the requirement to use the property for recreational purposes only. This bill authorized Los Angeles County to sell, transfer, or encumber Bruce's Beach, upon terms and conditions determined by the county board of supervisors to be in the best interest of the county and the general public.

AB 1121 (Weber), Chapter 319, Statutes of 2020, established an eight-member task force to do the following: study the issue of reparations for African Americans; propose ways to educate the California public about its findings; make recommendations on the forms that reparations might take; and submit a report of its findings to the Legislature, as specified.

8) **Arguments in Support.** Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara, sponsor of this bill, writes, "Historically, Chavez Ravine had been the home to a tightly knit, predominantly Mexican American community since the 1900s. The area served as a unique enclave where families

could own property and build generational wealth, navigating the challenges of targeted redlining of racial and ethnic groups, racist covenants, and discriminatory housing practices imposed by the City and County of Los Angeles. The Chavez Ravine neighborhoods of Palo Verde, La Loma, and Bishop Neighborhoods stood as one of the few areas accessible to Mexican-Americans and other historically marginalized populations seeking housing security in the face of systemic discrimination.

“In 1954, the City purchased the land from the Federal Housing Authority for a fraction of the price with the commitment to use the land for public purposes only and for the benefit of Angelinos. This provision was removed in 1957. In 1957, only 20 families continued resisting the City's offer to purchase the remaining properties in Chavez Ravine. In 1958, voters approved a referendum to convey the 315 acres of property to Walter O'Malley to construct a ballpark. In 1959, Los Angeles County sheriffs forcibly evicted the last 20 families from their homes.

“The destruction of Chavez Ravine marked the tragic end to a once-thriving predominantly Mexican American community, the profound result of discriminatory urban development decisions at the expense of marginalized populations.

“Throughout my career in public service, my focus has been on serving those that have been underserved and disenfranchised. It is time to both recognize the injustice of these local government actions and right the wrongs imposed on the people living in those neighborhoods. These families and their descendants have waited long enough, and it is now time act. This bill is a reasoned approach to help heal the deep scars in this community.”

9) **Arguments in Opposition.** None on file.

10) **Double-Referral.** This bill was double-referred to the Assembly Judiciary Committee, where it passed on a 10-1 vote on April 10, 2024.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara [SPONSOR]
Inclusive Action for The City
Latino Equality Alliance
Public Counsel
Somos Group LLC

Opposition

None on file.

Analysis Prepared by: Angela Mapp / L. GOV. / (916) 319-3958, Linda Rios / L. GOV. / (916) 319-3958